UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/690,669 | 10/23/2003 | Matthew Lerner | MS305992.01/MSFTP2336US | 5871 |

27195          7590          04/03/2009
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
127 Public Square
57th Floor, Key Tower
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| RUTLEDGE, AMELIA L |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2176 | |

| NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 04/03/2009 | ELECTRONIC |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|
| | 10/690,669 | LERNER ET AL. |
| **Office Action Summary** | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | AMELIA RUTLEDGE | 2176 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 December 2008</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.        2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1,8,11-13,21,24,26,45-50 and 55-62</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) <u>62</u> is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1,8,11-13,21,24,26,45-50,56,57 and 61</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>55 and 58-60</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>23 October 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1.    This action is responsive to communications:  Amendment, filed 12/29/2008.

2.    Claims 1, 8, 11-13, 21, 24, 26, 45-50, and 55-62 are pending.  Claims 1, 13, and

62 are independent claims.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1.    The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.    **Claims 1, 8, 11-13, 21, 24, 26, 45-50, 56, 57, and 61 are rejected under 35**

**U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moran, U.S. Patent No. 6,509,912, issued**

**January 2003, in view of Saund, U.S. Patent No. 6,411,732 B1, issued June 2002,**

**and further in view of Matthews, et al. ("Matthews"), U.S. Patent No. 6,028,604,**

**issued February 2000.**

4.    **Regarding independent claim 1**, Moran teaches domain objects,

programmatically equivalent to the claimed property values, which are context specific

representations of information that are used in a freeform graphics system (Abstract,

Figs. 22 and 26, col. 2, l. 28-57; col. 13, l. 13-col. 14, l. 23; claim 1), and that domain

objects are represented in the system by a graphic objects, i.e., icons, representing an

instance of the domain object.

Moran teaches that the system receives a property value of a document or file on the system in electronic ink format (col. 21, l. 25-51; col. 22, l. 8-23). Moran teaches that system operations can be associated with user actions and the class definition of a domain object (col. 9, l. 50-col. 10, l. 10), therefore Moran suggests that the domain objects, i.e., property values may be received as part of a file or document save operation. While Moran does not explicitly teach *a rendering system for rendering a file save interface in response to the input system that receives the file save command,* Saund teaches an electronic ink interface board for rendering a file save interface, the input system configured to receive in electronic ink format a property value of a document or file on or accessible by the computer system in the file save interface, because Saund teaches that the electronic ink board allows a user to draw interface elements representing save actions (Fig. 31, 33) and performing file save commands for electronic ink property values in the save interface (col. 6, l. 45-col. 7, l. 64). For example, Saund teaches rendering an electronic ink file save interface and saving an image file or text (col. 7, l. 5-38).

Moran teaches *the input system is configured to receive in electronic ink format a property value of a document or file as well as a format policy of the property value on or accessible by the computer system in the file save interface, the format policy regulates a manner of rendering for the property value with regard to machine-generated text or electronic ink;* because Moran teaches that the system receives a property value of a document or file on the system in electronic ink format (col. 21, l. 25-51; col. 22, l. 8-23). Moran teaches that system operations can be associated with user

actions and the class definition of a domain object (col. 9, l. 50-col. 10, l. 10). Moran

teaches receiving a format policy of the property value where the format policy regulates

a manner of rendering for the property value with regard to machine generated text or

electronic ink, because Moran teaches freeform editing to manipulate and perform

operations on the icon representation of the domain object (col. 6, l. 6-54, especially l.

42-54; col. 8, l. 65-col. 9, l. 59).

Moran teaches a storage, access, and rendering system for the domain objects

(col. 6, l. 20-col. 7, l. 25), compare to claim 1, *a storage system that stores the property*

*value and format policy of the document or file; and an access system that allows the*

*operating system to access the stored property value and policy, wherein the rendering*

*system renders the stored property value in accordance with the format policy as part of*

*a file preview operation.... the property value in electronic ink format includes an*

*electronic ink filename for the document or file.*

Moran teaches that the property value in electronic ink format includes an

electronic ink title for the document or file (col. 13, l. 13-col. 14, l. 23; especially col. 14,

l. 5-6; col. 21, l. 52-60), and that the title may be rendered as part of a file list operation

(col. 10, l. 60-col. 11, l. 31). Moran teaches that the title may be rendered as part of a

file preview operation (col. 13, l. 20-29), since Moran discloses that the user may

expand the information about a domain object by double tapping on the icon, this will

result in another layout of the domain object being displayed as an overlay, i.e., file

preview. Moran teaches assigning a title to the document, equivalent to a document

filename, rendered in electronic ink (col. 13, l. 13-col. 14, l. 23; especially col. 14, l. 5-6; col. 21, l. 52-60).

While Moran teaches a file preview operation, Moran does not explicitly teach that *the file preview discloses a limited information portion of the document or file.* However, Matthews teaches a preview data structure to provide for a variety of multimedia presentations, which includes file types and icons to display information and text associated with an application, and which may display a limited information portion of the file (col. 15, l. 37-col. 16, l. 39). Matthews teaches retrieving and playing the preview files, and if the selection was chosen by the user for execution, the selected application, i.e., file, will be retrieved (col. 16, l. 1-18).

Moran, Matthews, and Sound are directed toward graphical user interface systems. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the user drawn electronic ink interface elements and tokens disclosed by Saund with the freeform graphics system and domain objects disclosed by Moran, and the file preview features disclosed by Matthews, since Moran, Saund, and Matthews each disclosed known prior art graphical user interface elements that could have been combined to produce predictable results; because Matthews disclosed the use of a variety of file types for file previews (col. 15, l. 37-63), and Moran and Saund disclosed the storage of ink objects and properties in systems which would have facilitated the combination of the disclosed graphical user interface elements.

**Regarding dependent claim 8**, Moran teaches that the input system is activated in response to a command from an application program requesting activation of

electronic ink input with respect to at least one document or file in the application

program, since Moran teaches that the freeform editing program requests activation of

electronic ink input with respect to documents or files in the program (col. 6, l. 20-col. 7,

l. 25).

       **Regarding dependent claims 11 and 12**, Moran teaches that the input system

receives from a user a change to the property value associated with the document or

file (col. 13, l. 13-col. 14, l. 23; claim 1), and that the property value includes an

electronic ink title (col. 13, l. 13-col. 14, l. 23; especially col. 14, l. 5-6; col. 21, l. 52-60).

       **Regarding independent claim 13**, Moran teaches domain objects,

programmatically equivalent to the claimed property values, which are context specific

representations of information that are used in a freeform graphics system (Abstract,

Figs. 22 and 26, col. 2, l. 28-57; col. 13, l. 13-col. 14, l. 23; claim 1), and that domain

objects are represented in the system by a graphic object, i.e., icon, representing an

instance of the domain object.

       Moran teaches that the system receives a property value of a document or file on

the system in electronic ink format (col. 21, l. 25-51; col. 22, l. 8-23), compare to

*receiving a file save command*. Moran teaches that system operations can be

associated with user actions and the class definition of a domain object (col. 9, l. 50-col.

10, l. 10), therefore Moran suggests that the domain objects, i.e., property values, may

be received as part of a file or document save operation. While Moran does not

explicitly teach *displaying a file save interface responsive to receiving the file save*

*command; receiving in electronic ink format in the file save interface a property value of*

*a document or file on or accessible by a computer;* Saund teaches an electronic ink

interface board for rendering a file save interface, the input system configured to receive

in electronic ink format a property value of a document or file on or accessible by the

computer system in the file save interface, because Saund teaches that the electronic

ink board allows a user to draw interface elements representing save actions (Fig. 31,

33) and performing file save commands for electronic ink property values in the save

interface (col. 6, l. 45-col. 7, l. 64). For example, Saund teaches rendering an electronic

ink file save interface and saving an image file or text (col. 7, l. 5-38).

Moran teaches a storage, access, and rendering system for the domain objects

(col. 6, l. 20-col. 7, l. 25), compare to claim 1,...*storing the property value of the*

*document or file in electronic ink format for a later display on a display-interface in*

*electronic ink format; providing operating system access to the stored property value in*

*electronic ink format;*

*obtaining a request to render the stored property value;*

*determining a format manner upon how to render the stored property value;*

because Moran teaches that the property value in electronic ink format includes an

electronic ink title for the document or file (col. 13, l. 13-col. 14, l. 23; especially col. 14,

l. 5-6; col. 21, l. 52-60), and that the title may be rendered as part of a file list operation

(col. 10, l. 60-col. 11, l. 31). Moran teaches freeform editing to manipulate and perform

operations on the icon representation of the domain object (col. 6, l. 6-54, especially l.

42-54; col. 8, l. 65-col. 9, l. 59), i.e., determining a format manner upon how to render

the stored property value.  Moran teaches that the values of particular attributes can also be dynamically computed (col. 9, l. 65-col. 10, l. 24).

Moran teaches *rendering the stored property value in accordance with the determined format manner as part of a file preview operation*.  Moran teaches that the title may be rendered as part of a file preview operation (col. 13, l. 20-29), since Moran discloses that the user may expand the information about a domain object by double tapping on the icon, this will result in another layout of the domain object being displayed as an overlay, i.e., file preview.  Moran teaches assigning a title to the document, equivalent to a document filename, rendered in electronic ink (col. 13, l. 13-col. 14, l. 23; especially col. 14, l. 5-6; col. 21, l. 52-60), compare to *wherein the property value in electronic ink format includes an electronic ink filename for the document or file*.

While Moran teaches a file preview operation, Moran does not explicitly teach that *the file preview operation filters information of the document or file such that a portion less than a whole of the document or less than a whole of the file is part of a file preview*.  However, Matthews teaches a preview data structure to provide for a variety of multimedia presentations, which includes file types and icons to display information and text associated with an application, and which may display a limited information portion of the file (col. 15, l. 37-col. 16, l. 39).  Matthews teaches retrieving and playing the preview files, and if the selection was chosen by the user for execution, the selected application, i.e., file, will be retrieved (col. 16, l. 1-18).

Moran, Matthews, and Saund are directed toward graphical user interface systems. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the user drawn electronic ink interface elements and tokens disclosed by Saund with the freeform graphics system and domain objects disclosed by Moran, and the file preview features disclosed by Matthews, since Moran, Saund, and Matthews each disclosed known prior art graphical user interface elements that could have been combined to produce predictable results; because Matthews disclosed the use of a variety of file types for file previews (col. 15, l. 37-63), and Moran and Saund disclosed the storage of ink objects and properties in systems which would have facilitated the combination of the disclosed graphical user interface elements.

**Regarding dependent claim 21, 24, and 26**, claims 21, 24, and 26 reflect the methods implemented by the system as claimed in claims 8, 11, and 12, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

**Regarding dependent claim 45**, Moran teaches disclosing the file preview (col. 13, l. 20-29), since Moran discloses that the user may expand the information about a domain object by double tapping on the icon, this will result in another layout of the domain object being displayed as an overlay, i.e., file preview. Moran teaches disclosing the file preview in accordance with the policy, because Moran teaches receiving a format policy of the property value where the format policy regulates a manner of rendering for the property value with regard to machine generated text or electronic ink, because Moran teaches freeform editing to manipulate and perform

operations on the icon representation of the domain object, which includes the overlays (col. 6, l. 6-54, especially l. 42-54; col. 8, l. 65-col. 9, l. 59).

   **Regarding dependent claim 46 and 47**, Matthews teaches that the preview includes at least two functions, and that one of the functions includes expanding the file preview into the file, since Matthews teaches retrieving and playing the preview files, and if the selection was chosen by the user for execution, the selected application, i.e., file, will be retrieved (col. 16, l. 1-18).

   **Regarding dependent claims 48-50**, claims 48-50 are substantially similar to dependent claims 45-47, and are rejected along the same rationale.

   **Regarding dependent claim 56**, Moran teaches that the format policy dictates rendering in a machine-generated text in one instance and rendering in electronic ink format in another instance, because Moran teaches freeform editing to manipulate and perform operations on the icon representation of the domain object (col. 6, l. 6-54, especially l. 42-54; col. 8, l. 65-col. 9, l. 59). Moran teaches lists, running text, and table structures and regions defined by boundaries (col. 10, l. 10-30), and Moran teaches icons of both electronic ink and text (Fig. 25, item 2601; item 2502).

   **Regarding dependent claim 57**, Moran teaches the rendering system collects a user preference that is used to manipulate the format policy in at least one instance, because Moran teaches that there are two kinds of attribute values of an object, either implicit from information about the object in the database or from user input (col. 7, l. 33-60).

**Regarding dependent claim 61**, Moran teaches the manner is automatically determined, because Moran teaches that there are two kinds of attribute values of an object, either implicit from information about the object in the database or from user input (col. 7, l. 33-60), therefore unless there is user input, the manner is automatically determined.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Independent claim 62 is allowed.

Claims 55 and 58-60 are objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims (1 and 13), but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/29/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

While applicant argues in regard to independent claim 1 that Moran does not disclose the newly claimed limitation of claim 1 *...a format policy of the property value... the format policy regulates a manner of rendering for the property value with regard to machine-generated text or electronic ink*, (see Remarks, p. 8, par. 2), however Moran does disclose receiving a format policy of the property value where the format policy regulates a manner of rendering for the property value with regard to machine generated text or electronic ink, because Moran teaches freeform editing to manipulate

and perform operations on the icon representation of the domain object (col. 6, l. 6-54, especially l. 42-54; col. 8, l. 65-col. 9, l. 59).  For similar reasons, Moran teaches the limitations of dependent claim 45, because in the cited portion, Moran teaches displaying an overlay layout for the domain object in accordance with the format policy (see Remarks, p. 8, par. 3).

Independent claim 13 and dependent claim 48 claim a "format manner" corresponding to the "format policy" of claims 1 and 45, above (see Remarks, p. 8, par. 3-4).  For similar reasons, Moran teaches a format manner, and displaying an overlay layout for the domain object in accordance with the format manner (col. 6, l. 6-54, especially l. 42-54; col. 8, l. 65-col. 9, l. 59).

## Conclusion

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.**  Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.  In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action.  In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AMELIA RUTLEDGE whose telephone number is (571)272-7508. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:30 - 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Amelia  Rutledge/
Examiner, Art Unit 2176